

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the continued detailed examination evidenced by the final Official Action mailed February 1, 2006 (hereinafter the Final Official Action). Applicants further appreciate the Examiner expanding on the rejections first issued in the Official Action mailed October 7, 2005. However, Applicants respectfully maintain that none of the cited references discloses or suggested the subject matter of the present claims.

In the interest of brevity, Applicants remarks focus only on the recitations of independent Claim 1¹, which recites in part:

transmitting a message from a networked GPS time server to a mobile station, the message including GPS referenced time information indicating an elapsed GPS referenced time interval at the networked GPS time server between receiving a request for GPS time assistance at the networked GPS time server and transmitting the message to the mobile station.

As reflected in the above-emphasized recitations of independent Claim 1, a message transmitted from the time server to the mobile station includes GPS referenced time that indicates an elapsed GPS referenced time interval at the networked GPS time server (that represents the time interval between receiving a request and transmitting the message). In contrast, it appears that the Final Official Action is focusing on aspects of the cited references that refer to the delay associated with message propagation. However, Applicants' claims recite very different subject matter and, instead, focus on transmitting a message that includes "an elapsed...time interval at a networked GPS time server..." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully maintain that the cited references, taken either singularly or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the recitations of the pending claims.

For example, as stated in Applicants' previous response:

¹ However to ensure that the present submission is fully responsive to the Final Official Action, Applicants hereby incorporate all of the Applicants' previous responses herein by reference.

Furthermore, even assuming for the sake of argument that the cited passage of Zhao did discuss accounting for the transmission time, the transmission time associated with the distance D is not incurred at the network GPS time server, but rather is incurred during the travel time of the message from the base station to the mobile station. Therefore, even if the cited passage of Zhao were considered for the sake of argument to discuss accounting for propagation time, the propagation time discussed would not disclose or suggest the type of delay recited in Applicants' independent Claims 1, 21, and 39. Accordingly, Zhao does not disclose or suggest all of the recitations of the independent claims for at least the reasons described above.


Applicants' December 30, 2005 Amendment, page 13.

As shown by the above cited passage of Applicants' previous response, Applicants respectfully submit that Zhao does not relate at all to an elapsed time interval at a server, but rather focuses on propagation time for transmissions.

With regard to Dussell and McClennon, Applicants also contend that neither of these references discloses or suggests the pending claims. For example, McClennon discusses echo control for audio information transmitted over a network. Respectfully, McClennon determines a "roundtrip," which relates to propagation delay, not to an elapsed time within a networked GPS time server as claimed.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of all rejections and the allowance of all claims in due course for at least the reasons described herein (and in Applicants' previous response). If the Examiner believes that a teleconference would be of assistance in addressing any of the issues raised in either the Final Official Action or this response, the Examiner is sincerely invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to discuss any of these issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert N. Crouse
Registration No. 44,635


In re: •Hansson et al.
Serial No.: 10/729,354
Filed: December 5, 2003
Page 12 of 12



USPTO Customer No. 20792
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec
Post Office Box 37428
Raleigh, North Carolina 27627
Telephone: 919/854-1400
Facsimile: 919/854-1401

Certificate of Mailing under 37 CFR 1.8 (or 1.10)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on March 31, 2006.



Audra Wooten